FT. McCLELLAN BCT MEETING MINUTES
PARTNERING SESSION #46
FT. McCLELLAN, AL
JULY 17-18, 2002

AGENDA ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
Check In Guest Introduction and Roles	Host: Ron Levy Leader: Recorder: Troy Winton	See Attendees List – Attachment A.
Ground Rules	BCT	Attachment B provides the ground rules, as revised in January, 2001.
Agenda	BCT	Attachment C provides the draft August agenda. Attachment D provides the July meeting summary.
Accept Previous Minutes	BCT	The team reviewed the draft June minutes, and accepted the minutes without revisions as final.
Action Items	BCT	Action items were reviewed and updated, as indicated in Attachment D.
Long-Term Planning (BCP)	BCT	IT provided a final BCP on December 21, 2001.
Goals/Metrics Update	BCT	The team began brainstorming this topic during the June, 1998 meeting, and also began development of preliminary goals for consideration by the group. This topic requires the BCT to set aside schedule time to address.
Facilitator Observations	David Sanderson	David Sanderson attended his twenty-seventh meeting with the team. His notes and observations are provided at Attachment E.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES
BCT SESSION #46
FT. McCLELLAN, AL
JULY 17-18, 2002

Attendees:
Ron Levy, Ft. McClellan (FTMC)
Ellis Pope, Mobile District Corps of Engineers
Philip Stroud, Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM)
Doyle Brittain, Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV (EPA)
Dan Copeland, US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC)
Miki Schneider, Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
Bernie Case, Alabama Army National Guard (AL-ARNG)
Wayne Sartwell, AL-ARNG
JoAnn Watson, National Guard Bureau (by telephone)
Steve Moran, Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (Shaw)
David Sanderson, Eagle Point Consulting
Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corp. (FWENC)

Guests:
Porter Morgan, CEHNC
Larry Lumeh, CC Johnson and Malhotra (by telephone)
Lee Coker, USACE-Mobile
Bill Woodall, USACE-Mobile
Chip Parrot, USACE-Mobile
Francine Cole, TRADOC
Hugh Vick, Gannett Fleming
Ben Bentkowski, Gannett Fleming
Jim Grassiano, ADEM
Mark Harrison, ADEM
Spencer Nelson, URS Corp.
Karen Pinson, FTMC
Lee Jaye, FTMC
Josh Jenkins, Shaw
Bill Hedberg, Shaw
Troy Winton, Shaw

ATTACHMENT B

BCT GROUND RULES

General:

1. Leave rank and title at the door, and have a free and open discussion on any subject affecting the BCT.
2. Work smarter, not harder: create ways to simplify and streamline the BCT process.
3. Identify and express individual team members' sensitive issues, and agree to keep them within the team.
4. Alert other team members of any changes in cost or schedules.
5. Rotate meeting leaders.
6. Have fun.

Meeting Behavior:

1. Come prepared; do your homework.
2. Participate fully: offer your perspective and advice for the benefit of the whole team.
3. Listen to others' views and opinions, try to understand their needs, respect them, and work to resolve differences, and support team decisions.
4. Draw out other members: be open to other ideas and different perspectives.
5. Avoid interruptions and side conversations.
6. Call time out when necessary.
7. Make decisions by consensus: all in agreement, all owning the decision.
8. Turn off cell phones.

ATTACHMENT C

BCT MEETING AGENDA

1. Check In

2. Guest Introduction/Role in Meeting

3. Review Ground Rules (Attachment B to these minutes)

4. Finalize Agenda with additions and/or subtractions (Item 9 of this Attachment)

5. Accept Previous Meeting Minutes

6. Review Action Items from Previous Minutes (Attachment D to these minutes)

7. Review Long-Term Planning (BCP)

8. Goals/Metrics Update

9. Accomplish Agenda Items (Item 9 of this Attachment)

10. Meeting Summary Review

- Set next meeting date
- Set next meeting agenda
- Set time and date for conference call
- Set meeting dates for next six months
- Review action and consensus items
- Review and evaluate Partnering Process

ITEM #9
DRAFT AUGUST AGENDA

Tuesday, August 20, 2002

0800 – 0830	Check-in/Finalize Minutes/Agenda/Action Items	BCT
0830 – 1130	Teambuilding	David
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1430	Puls-Barcelona Low-flow Groundwater Data Comparison	Shaw
1430 – 1700	Work Plans for T-5, T-6, and Cane Creek Training Area	Shaw

Breaks as Needed
Dinner Plans

Wednesday, August 21, 2002

0800 – 0830	JPA Update	Miki
0830 – 1000	Ranges West of IMR SI Results	Shaw
1000 – 1130	TBD	
1130 – 1300	Lunch	
1300 – 1530	TBD	
1530 – 1630	Parking Lot and Meeting Reflections	BCT

Breaks as Needed

Parking Lot

ATTACHMENT D

MEETING SUMMARY
With
ACTION ITEMS

Next BCT Meeting: August 20 - 21, 2002
Ft. McClellan, AL

Primary Agenda: See Item #9

July Meeting Summary:

Check-In - Team members introduced themselves and told the group why they were at the meeting and what they wanted to achieve.

Finalize Agenda and Minutes – The team reviewed the June minutes and accepted them as final. The following items were removed from the July agenda:

- Area North of MOUT
- Impact Area North-Central Main Post, Parcel 132Q-X

The project team added the following items to the parking lot:

- Eastern Bypass
- Flying J
- Baby Bains Gap Road Ranges
- Comments on Iron Mountain Road Problem Formulation and Bains Gap Road SLERA
- Document review and issuance.

Action Items - The BCT reviewed July's action items; the updates are presented in Attachment D at the end of this text.

Installation-Wide Work Plan – Ron wants to re-issue cover letter explaining what changes were made to the Installation-Wide Work Plan (IWWP). Doyle would like to resolve comments on the revised IWWP. Steve discussed the general nature of the comments received, which primarily dealt with risk assessment. ADEM comments have not been received and are currently in internal review. Doyle suggested that Shaw risk assessment personnel contact EPA risk personnel before responding to comments. ADEM will issue its comments on the revised IWWP.

ADEM Concurrence on Minutes/Tier II Participation – This issue was brought up at the June BCT meeting. ADEM did not concur with the May minutes. Jim Grassiano wants to be careful with the content of the BCT minutes. Ron indicated that the minutes are sent for review prior to finalization. Francine Cole sought to clarify Tier II role (empowerment, authority) and reiterated that the BCT decision makers are EPA (Doyle), ADEM (Philip), and the Army (Ron). Francine will take this issue to

Tier II and report back to the group. Doyle suggested partnering training from Tier II and III. Francine provided copies of *ADEM Tier II Partnering Team Guidelines and Procedures Notebook.* ADEM will provide comments on May minutes so that they can be finalized during the August BCT meeting.

The Blue Hole – This site was most recently discussed at the June BCT meeting. Philip summarized the issues and ADEM's concern regarding this site. Although a preliminary risk assessment (PRA) was performed, ADEM questions whether there are enough data to characterize the site. Ron suggested calling Paul Goetchius to get his input. Discussion was tabled until the following day until Paul could be reached via telephone. Jim Grassiano explained that the data were insufficient to characterize the site and therefore insufficient for the PRA. Paul indicated that the data are sufficient for the PRA because the most likely contaminated areas were sampled (i.e., biased sampling). Furthermore, from a risk assessment standpoint, Paul explained the site does not pose an unacceptable human health threat in an unrestricted reuse scenario. After some discussion, the BCT agreed that Shaw will revise the Final Blue Hole report to indicate the BCT's site management decision not to collect additional samples and to release the site for military training reuse rather than unrestricted reuse. Shaw will also revise the PRA explaining the biased sampling and include in the revised final report.

Range 30 Options (EE/CA vs. RI/FS) – Shaw issued SI letter report for this site and recommended that the site be further investigated under an RI/FS. Doyle suggested doing a focused feasibility study (FFS) with 2 or 3 options (e.g., no-action, unrestricted reuse etc). BCT agreed to RI/FS at this site with specifics of the FS to be worked further along in the process. Doyle suggested beginning FS concurrent with the RI to speed the process as much as possible.

Document Status Tracking – At the time of the meeting, Doyle had not received an electronic version of FTMC's document status tracking spreadsheet from Lisa. However, hard copies of the spreadsheet were provided at the meeting. Ron asked that Doyle review the document status tracking spreadsheet and take the appropriate actions. Henceforth, Lisa will send out the document status tracking spreadsheet on a regular basis, separate from the BCT meeting minutes.

Options for Impact Area South of POW Training Facility – SI data from this site originally presented at May 2002 BCT meeting; however, Shaw did not make any recommendations for this site at the May BCT. During this meeting, Shaw recommended a supplemental SI to define the extent of metals in soil and explosives/pesticides in groundwater. Doyle generally agreed with proposed approach but wants specifics with regard to number and location of additional samples. Philip agreed with Doyle and wants a closer look at the data. Ellis agreed that a supplemental SI is the appropriate path forward for this site. Ron initially expressed some concern that this site could end up in a RI but, after group discussion, agreed with the supplemental SI approach.

Landfill No. 3 RI Update – Josh and Bill provided an update of the Landfill No. 3 RI. Four main topics were discussed: chronology of events; groundwater flow direction; revised geology and bedrock structure; and revised contaminant distribution. The groundwater plume is defined to the west and south of Landfill No. 3; the City of Weaver wells have not been impacted. Three inferred faults are located between Landfill No. 3 and the Weaver wells. The plume trends north-south along Highway 21, although the northern extent of the plume has not yet been defined. Also, the vertical extent of the plume is not defined to the north. Shaw recommended installing previously identified contingency wells to the north-northwest and northeast and continuing quarterly monitoring. Doyle wanted it noted

that there are clean wells between the landfill and the City of Weaver wells. Philip wants to monitor the wells west of Landfill No. 3 in particular. The BCT agreed with the proposed approach with specifics regarding contingency well locations and quarterly monitoring to be provided at a later date.

Following the discussion of Landfill No. 3, Doyle suggested forming a groundwater subcommittee to discuss and evaluate groundwater issues at FTMC sites (e.g., landfills). The groundwater subcommittee will include representatives from ADEM (Philip), EPA (Ben), USACE (Chip), and Shaw (Josh, Bill, and Steve). The groundwater subcommittee would provide input to the BCT. Steve voiced concern that the subcommittee would "operate in a vacuum" without regard for costs, schedule, etc. The group otherwise embraced the idea of forming the subcommittee. Doyle would also like the groundwater subcommittee to review the upcoming Landfill No. 3 presentation for the RAB with the intent of simplifying/streamlining it to assist the public's understanding of the information/issues. Josh will organize the committee and coordinate its proceedings.

As a separate issue, Ron requested that ADEM speak to the owners of the junkyard across the road from Landfill No. 3 to inquire about what may have possibly been placed there or spilled. Philip explained that ADEM has started the process of communicating with the property owner.

JPA Update – The JPA is aiming to have report (landfill comments) out in August. Ron told the JPA contractors to contact Shaw for information, as necessary.

JPA is considering donating the "500 area" for the National Preparedness University.

Mock Village at Yahou Lake, Parcel 130Q-X – Josh presented the supplemental SI data summary (the SI data were previously presented to the BCT in September 2001). The issue at this site is chlorinated VOCs in groundwater. Shaw recommended two complete additional rounds of groundwater sampling (for VOCs only) as well as additional water level measurements as a continuation of the supplemental SI. The BCT agreed with this course of action. The additional sampling and water levels will be performed during the dry season and the wet season. The possibility of installing additional wells at this site and moving to a remedial investigation will be evaluated after reviewing the additional data.

Former Rifle/Machine Gun Range, Parcel 98Q – Steve presented SI data summary for this site. Ron indicated that this parcel is located within the proposed wildlife refuge area. Philip and Doyle both expressed concern over the constituents of potential ecological concern, particularly metals in surface soil. Philip wants an ecological risk assessment. Doyle indicated that he cannot make a decision on this site based on the way the material is presented and asked that Shaw rework the presentation. He wants "clean lines" drawn (iso-contour maps) for metals in soil and the one pesticide in groundwater. Shaw will revise this presentation and re-present at a later date. Shaw will also perform a preliminary ecological risk assessment (PERA) for this site.

Historical Ranges, Parcels 92, 93, 107, 133, 134 – Steve presented SI data summary for this site. Ron indicated that this parcel is partially located within the proposed wildlife refuge area. This site has similar issues (primarily metals in soils) as Parcel 98Q. Shaw will rework the presentation to include iso-contour maps for metals in soils. Shaw will also perform a PRA and PERA for this site and include in future presentation.

Former Rifle/Machine Gun Range, Parcel 99Q – Steve presented SI data summary for this site, which is located within the wildlife refuge area. After reviewing the data, the BCT agreed to "No Further Action" and unrestricted reuse with regard to hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste (HTRW). Shaw will issue the draft-final report. Because this site is located within the refuge area, Shaw will send a copy of the draft-final report to Bill Garland (USFWS).

Eastern Bypass – Doyle initiated discussion regarding reconstruction of a creek in the Bypass area. He observed during a site visit that the creek had filled with dirt and wood chips and was blocked. Doyle wants the creek flow to be restored. Porter Morgan left during the meeting to assess the situation and report back to Doyle.

Flying J – Ron wanted to explain/clarify an area in the FOST. The small area in question was originally part of the Ranges West of Iron Mountain Road, along the northern boundary of that area of investigation. The Army is asking ADEM to give them some leeway in FOSTing this area so that ALDOT can proceed with construction of the Eastern Bypass. Ron wants to ensure that there are no surprises regarding this issue when ADEM reviews the document.

Baby Bains Gap Road Ranges – Steve provided an update of the sample results, which indicated high hits of nitroexplosives in some soil samples in the firing line areas of certain ranges. Steve wanted to clarify whether Shaw should proceed with additional sampling to delineate the "hot spots" and fill in data gaps. Doyle indicated that he prefers to have some flexibility in the work plans to allow additional sampling, as needed, to address these situations as we find them rather than wait for BCT approval. The BCT agreed to doing additional "hot spot" delineation sampling at the Baby Bains Gap Road Ranges.

Iron Mountain Road Problem Formulation and Bains Gap Road SLERA Comments – Steve distributed responses to comments received by EPA and CHPPM on these documents. To date, no comments have been received from ADEM. The scheduled due date of July 24, 2002, may slip if Shaw does not receive comments. Ron wants to be able to get to the field to begin work. Doyle suggested a meeting or conference call to expedite the process to meet field work scheduled to begin September 1, 2002. Shaw will arrange this meeting with the appropriate personnel. Ron prefers to have the meeting at FTMC but a conference call could be an option. Doyle asked that Steve e-mail the comment responses to him.

Document Review and Issuance – The issue regarding receiving comments on Final documents was discussed. Ron and Francine indicated that final documents should be final with no further changes. Ron wants to ensure that all internal comments are received and resolved prior to presenting information to the public. Miki expressed concern about the public's perception of BCT agreement on documents prior to public presentation. Ron felt that the public would not be unduly influenced and indicated that any public comments or concerns would be addressed anyway. Ron just wants to have a group consensus prior to going public with information. To address this issue, the group agreed that large, complex documents (e.g., RIs, EE/CAs) will be issued as follows: Draft, Draft-Final, and Final. Smaller, less complex sites presented during BCT on-board reviews will be issued as Draft-Final and then Final once regulator approval is received.

Meeting Reflections – The group generally agreed that this was a positive and productive meeting.

August Events - RAB on August 19; BCT meeting on August 20 - 21.

Future Meetings (3-month look ahead) - August 20 – 21 @ Ft. McClellan; September 18 – 20 @ Orange Beach; October 16 – 17 @ Ft. McClellan.

Status of Action Items

Action Item No.	Responsible Team Member	Due Date	Status	Action Item
02/2/3	Philip	Mar 02	SNR	Report back to BCT on ADEM's position on the Pelham Range Water Supply issue.
02/5/2	Ron	July 02	Done	Review options on the Area South of POW Training Facility and report back to the BCT.
02/6/1	Ron	July 02	Done	Provide guidance to project team on remedial action objectives for the feasibility studies at MP 1500 and Parcel 66.
02/6/2	Porter	July 02	Done	Look at soils data for Rocket City and get back to Philip on issue of sampling for explosives.
02/6/3	Lisa	July 02	SNR	Email Ft. McClellan's document tracking status spreadsheet to Doyle.
02/7/1	Steve	July 02	SNR	Have Shaw risk assessment personnel contact EPA risk personnel prior to responding to EPA comments on revised IWWP.
02/7/2	Philip	Aug. 02	SNR	Provide comments on revised IWWP.
02/7/3	Francine	Aug. 02	SNR	Clarify Tier II role and report back.
02/7/4	Philip	Aug. 02	SNR	Provide comments/revisions to May 2002 BCT meeting minutes.
02/7/5	Josh	July 02	SNR	Organize groundwater subcommittee and begin discussing issues.
02/7/6	Philip	Aug 02	SNR	Report on the status of contacting the junkyard owners across from LF3
02/7/7	Steve	July 02	SNR	Arrange meeting to resolve comments on IMR Problem Formulation and BBGR SLERA.
02/7/8	Steve	July 02	SNR	E-mail comment responses on IMR Problem Formulation and BBGR SLERA to Doyle.

SNR=Status Next Report

ATTACHMENT E

FACILITATOR NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

Meeting Summary

The BCT met at Fort McClellan on July 17-18, 2002. With as many as 24 participants on the first day, it was by far the largest meeting the BCT has held. Francine Cole, the BCT's link to Tier II, attended both days, as did Jim Grassiano from ADEM. Bill Woodall attended from the Mobile Region Corps, with Lee Coker and Chip Parrott, who are replacing Ellis Pope on the BCT; Ellis was attending his last meeting on the BCT. Despite the large number of people, the group generally functioned well, with few side conversations and good focus on the agenda.

There were many procedural agreements, including a way to resolve comments on the updated Institution-Wide Work Plan; the monthly distribution of Lisa's Document Tracking System; a reinstatement of "draft" final documents in order to ensure that final documents are really final; the creation of a groundwater subcommittee to propose next steps and report to the RAB on groundwater near Landfill 3; the need to have full BCT consensus before documents go to the public for review; the need for further analysis of data on large, undeveloped sites; and a new understanding that work plans may be considered flexible, allowing contractors to do additional sampling when necessary.

Change and clarifications were two major themes of the meeting, and while the changes will almost surely bring a smoother process in the future they were challenging at times for various members. I was impressed by how well individual team members managed the frustrations. The BCT's self-management is increasing, and team members generally are demonstrating that they want to collaborate.

The agenda also included substantive agreements on sites. Dan and Philip reported that they are creating a way to sample soils in Rocket City that will not hold up the work. In consultation with Paul Goetchius of the Shaw group, the BCT agreed to NFA status on a Pelham Range site. A highlight of the meeting was Josh's long, complex, and well-done presentation on groundwater around Landfill 3.

The presence of Francine and Jim allowed for a direct airing with Tier II members of BCT concerns about the integrity of the BCT and the empowerment of ADEM's representative on the BCT. Francine's interest in bringing this issue to Tier II next week is encouraging, and I hope the issue will be resolved. Doyle proposed that Tiers II and III sponsor a partnering training session for the BCT this fall, and I support that idea.

In the reflections on the meeting, members and guests noted these qualities of what they thought was a good meeting:

- A lot of talented people, lots of work going on
- A big meeting, but very productive
- Partly satisfied, partly frustrated – too many changes
- Better understanding of the regulators' perspectives
- Excellent groundwater presentation – a lot of good work by the Shaw group
- Appreciate how Ron as convener accommodated concerns of all members
- A lot accomplished – here and in the past year and a half; we're in a transition to bigger

sites, more complex issues, and I think we can work through them if we continue to adjust and work together
- Great cooperation in this meeting, and glad Tier II was here
- We did well – the discussions we've had outside our meetings have helped
- Great meeting – handled everything graciously.

Finally, the BCT said goodbye to Ellis, several BCT members thanking him for his substantial contributions to the team – his historical knowledge about FTMC and the BCT, his sense of fairness, and his interest in finding harmonious resolutions to conflict.